DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 793 EC 103 902

TITLE A Survey of Education for the Gifted and Talented in New York State in 1974-75.
INSTITUTION New York State Education Dept., Albany. Bureau of General Education Curriculum Development.
PUB DATE [76]
NOTE 111p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academically Gifted; *Administrative Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Gifted; Programs; *Regional Programs; *School Districts; *State Surveys; Talented Students; Talent Identification
IDENTIFIERS New York

ABSTRACT

Reported are results of two surveys of gifted and talented education in New York State during 1974-1975, one sent to each local public school district in the State and another sent to each of the 46 Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES). Major findings of the survey include: 92% of Boards of Education do not have a policy statement which commits the school district to gifted programing; eight out of ten school districts have no plans to initiate special programs for the gifted and talented; 98% of the districts use teacher nominations as a means of gifted identification; and group I.Q. tests are used in 66% of such districts. Results of the school district survey are presented question by question in tabular form with results separated into the "big five" (New York City, Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, and Yonkers) and the rest of the state. Questions are concerned with definition of the gifted, number of gifted pupils, administrative policies, state support, identification of the gifted, provision of enrichment experiences, and education of teachers of the gifted. The survey of the BOCES reports on questions dealing with formal policy statements, written administrative guidelines, the use of advisory councils and coordinators of programs for the gifted, and inservice teacher education programs. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED130493

A SURVEY OF EDUCATION

FOR THE GIFTED AND TALENTED

IN NEW YORK STATE

IN 1974-75

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joan Miller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

EE103702

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Bureau of General Education Curriculum Development
Albany, New York 12234

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Regents of The University (with years when terms expire)

1981 Theodore M. Black, A.B., Litt.D., LL.D., Pd.D., D.C.L., L.H.D., Chancellor - Sands Point
1987 Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr., A.B., M.B.A., D.C.S., H.H.D., Vice Chancellor- Purchase
1978 Alexander J. Allan, Jr., LL.D., Litt.D. - - - - - - - - - Troy
1986 Kenneth B. Clark, A.B., M.S., Ph.D., LL.D., L.H.D., D.Sc.- Hastings on Hudson
1983 Harold E. Newcomb, B.A. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Owego
1988 Willard A. Genrich, LL.B., L.H.D., LL.D.- - - - - - - - - Buffalo
1982 Emlyn I. Griffith, A.B., J.D. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Rome
1983 Mary Alice Kendall, B.S.- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Irondequoit
1984 Jorge L. Batista, B.A., J.D., LL.D. - - - - - - - - - - - Bronx
1982 Louis E. Yavner, LL.B.- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - New York
1979 Laura B. Chodos, B.A., M.A. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Clifton Park
1980 Martin C. Barell, B.A., I.A., LL.B. - - - - - - - - - - - - Kings Point
1981 Louise R. Bongiorno, B.S., M.D. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Brooklyn
1984 Joseph P. Matteoni, B.A., M.A., Ph.D. - - - - - - - - - - - Bayside
1981 J. Edward Meyer, B.A., LL.B.- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - Chappaqua

President of The University and Commissioner of Education
Gordon M. Ambach

Executive Deputy Commissioner of Education

Acting Deputy Commissioner for Elementary, Secondary and Continuing Education
John W. Polley

Acting Associate Commissioner for Instructional Services
Vivienne Anderson

Acting Assistant Commissioner for General Education and Curricular Services
Gordon E. Van Hooft

Director, Division for Curriculum Services

Chief, Bureau of General Education Curriculum Development
Herbert Bothamley

INTERPRETING THE SURVEY DATA

Essential Information

This report combines the results of two different but closely related surveys. One survey form was sent to each local public school district in the State. A different but briefer survey form was sent to each Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES). The results of both surveys are mutually complementary and reinforce one another in providing information that reflects the statewide need for developing comprehensive effective programming to serve the educational needs of the gifted and talented. The results of both surveys, therefore, have been combined in this one report.

In order to minimize the possibility of misinterpretation of the report, some information about the collection and treatment of the data is deemed essential. In May of 1975 the School District Survey forms were sent to the 738 operating public school districts in New York State, including New York City. In addition to the forms that were sent to the New York City Board of Education, copies were also sent to each of the 32 New York City Community School Districts. Thus, for survey purposes the survey forms were sent to a combined total of 770 school districts.

Returns from the school districts provided the Department with much more than an adequate sample. Out of a potential total of 770 returns, the Department received 707 responses, or 91.8 percent of the potential returns.

The Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) Survey forms were sent to all 46 BOCES. Out of a potential total of 46 returns, the Department received 46 responses or 100 percent of the potential returns.

In treating the data from the School District Survey forms, one response from the New York City Central Board of Education reflected data from the City High Schools, and 28 responses from the New York City Community School Districts reflected data representative of the Community School Districts. The responses received from 28 out of a total of 32 Community School Districts represented 87.5 percent of the total.

Data reported for the "Big Five" in tables 1 through 11 are based upon returns from 28 Community School Districts and one return for the New York City High Schools, and one return each from Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, and Yonkers, or a total of 33 returns.

Thus, the data used in tables 1 through 11 are based upon:

33 responses for all of the "Big Five" including the one response for the New York City High Schools and the 28 responses from the New York City Community School Districts
674 responses for the rest of the State

707 total responses

A Word of Caution

All of the schools were asked to respond to questions 1 through 15 in the School District Survey form. The data from these questions is presented in tables 1 through 11.

At the end of question No. 15, the school districts were directed not to complete any of the remaining questions in the Survey form unless they offered programming for their gifted and talented (in contrast to provisions).

The Survey defined the terms as follows:

- Programming results in a comprehensive offering sequenced over a long period of time, usually designed as a requirement, and very much a major part of the total school curriculum.

- Provisions, on the other hand, result in more fragmentary, ad hoc offerings, relatively brief in duration, often designed by an individual teacher with special abilities rather than by a curriculum committee, and supplemental to the major offerings, not integral with them.

Thus, those school districts which indicated that they offered only provisions or neither programming nor provisions were directed not to answer any of the remaining questions. Of the school districts that responded to questions 1 through 15 inclusive in the School District Survey, only 125 responded to the remaining questions (questions 16 through 37 inclusive). These 125 school districts were those which indicated that they offered programming to their gifted and talented children and youth as the term is defined above.

The 125 responses (representing 16.2 percent of the school districts in the State) to the remaining questions in the survey reflect only the status of efforts in those 125 school districts which indicated that they offered programming. It would not be valid to assume that the data from these 125 school districts were representative of all the school districts in the State because 582 of those that responded to the first 15 questions indicated that they did not have any programming for their gifted and talented.

In the presentation of the data in tables 12 through 28B inclusive, phrases like, "school districts throughout the State," or "of the school districts," or "throughout the remainder of the State," or "throughout the State," or "the total State's school districts" occur.

In correctly interpreting the data presented in these tables, it is essential to remember that the data reflect the responses of only those 125 school districts which indicated that they offered programming for their gifted and talented. These responses are not representative of all 770 school districts.

REMINDER

Interpretation of Tables 12 through 35B Inclusive

Of the total 707 school districts that responded to questions 1 through 15 inclusive in the School District Survey form, only 125 of them indicated that they offered programming (as defined in the survey forms) to their gifted and talented.

Only these 125 districts were asked to respond to the remaining questions that provided the data presented in tables 12 through 35B inclusive. The data was supplied by the following:

24 responses from the "Big Five" (one from New York City High Schools, 21 from New York City Community School Districts, one from Buffalo and one from Rochester)
101 responses from the rest of the State

125 total responses

Although the commentary at the bottom of the tables on the following pages contain phrases like, "school districts throughout the State," keep in mind that the percentages are based on only those 125 school districts which indicated that they offered programming to the gifted and talented.

INTRODUCTION

In 1975, a statewide survey of school systems and Boards of Cooperative Educational Services indicated the status of educational programs for the gifted and talented in New York State. This survey has served as the initial step in the preparation and implementation of a comprehensive long range State plan for education of the gifted and talented.

Overall, the survey findings provide substantial evidence of the need for improving services to the gifted and talented in New York State. The fact that 92 percent of the Boards of Education do not have a policy statement which commits the school district to a course of action seems to indicate that educational planning efforts concerning the gifted have low priority. Furthermore, the data indicate that nearly eight out of every ten school districts have no plans to initiate special programs for the gifted and talented. Judging from this statistic, it would seem that few school districts are prepared to truly make an effort at providing for individual differences.

Ninety eight percent of the districts rely on teacher nominations as a means of identification; group I.Q. tests are used in 66 percent of such districts. In the process of identifying the gifted pupil, 50 percent or greater of the selection by school districts takes place between the third and ninth grades. Despite the commendable efforts of some school districts, on a statewide basis, there is much yet to be done.

Gifted and talented children exist within all levels of society, within all racial and ethnic groups and they come from every kind of home. Any programs for identification, education, or inservice must be concerned with this diversity. Hopefully, local school districts will develop and conduct a status survey of their own and then design appropriate programs which meet the diverse needs of their uniquely gifted and talented youth.

The reader should interpret the results of this survey in terms of the complex needs of the gifted and talented, the multifaceted definition which includes six aspects which may overlap, the diversity of provisions and programs for different grade levels, and the lack of general recognition of the identifying characteristics of gifted and talented children. In addition, the reader will note that there are no tables for questions 4 and 7. The responses to these questions did not lend themselves to quantitative analysis.

QUESTION 1

DEFINITION OF THE GIFTED

Identified by professionally qualified persons, the gifted are those children and youth who, by virtue of outstanding abilities and potential are capable of high performance in general intellectual activities, specific academic aptitudes, creative and productive thinking, aesthetic expression, and in other areas. These are children and youth who require differentiated programming and services beyond those normally provided by the regular school program in order to realize their contribution to self and society.

1. To what extent does your school district endorse the above definition of the gifted? (Check one item only)

   a. Strongly Endorses . . . . . [ ] (1)
   b. Mildly Endorses . . . . . [ ] (2)
   c. Indifferent . . . . . [ ] (3)
   d. Mildly Opposed . . . . . [ ] (4)
   e. Strongly Opposed . . . . . [ ] (5)

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS ACCORDING TO THE EXTENT THAT THE DEFINITION OF THE GIFTED IS ENDORSED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE - 1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That The Given Definition Of The Gifted Is:									
	Strongly Endorsed		Mildly Endorsed		Indifferent		Mildly Opposed		Strongly Opposed	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
New York City										
High Schools	1									
Community Districts	21	75.0	7	25.0						
Buffalo	1									
Rochester			1							
Syracuse					1					
Yonkers			1							
Total "Big Five"	23	69.7	9	27.3	1	3.0				
Rest of State	290	43.0	283	42.0	66	9.8	21	3.1	14	2.1
Total State	313	44.3%	292	41.3%	67	9.5%	21	3.0%	14	2.0%

Table #1 indicates a general endorsement of the definition of the gifted by 85% of the school districts. The remaining 15% of the opposition was made up of returns largely from outside of the "Big Five."

QUESTION 2

2. Does your school district have its own definition of the gifted different from that given in question 1? . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT THEIR DEFINITION OF THE GIFTED IS DIFFERENT THAN THE DEFINITION GIVEN IN QUESTION 1

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That Their Definition Of The Gifted Is:			
	Different		Not Different	
	No.	%	No.	%
Total "Big Five"*	7	21.2	26	78.8
Rest of State	28	4.2	646	95.8
Total State	35	5.0%	672	95.0%

The definition was different for approximately 21% of the school districts of the "Big Five"; however, the definition did not differ for 96% of the rest of the States' school districts.

QUESTION 3

3. What is the number of gifted pupils in your school population? . . . . . [ ]

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS
INDICATING STUDENTS LISTED AS GIFTED, ENROLLED IN GIFTED PROGRAMS AND
PROFESSIONAL STAFF ENGAGED IN COORDINATING GIFTED PROGRAMS ON DISTRICT LEVEL

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE - 1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	Students Listed As Gifted			Gifted Students In Programs			
	Students Enrolled	Number of Students Listed As Gifted	Percent of Gifted Students	Boys		Girls	
				No.	%	No.	%
New York City							
High Schools	342,940	30,000	8.7	15,000	50.0	15,000	50.0
Community Districts	781,044	45,805	5.9	8,547	46.0	10,037	54.0
Buffalo	58,113	2,800	4.8				
Rochester	42,367	1,400	3.3				
Syracuse	26,241						
Yonkers	28,234	580	2.1				
Total "Big Five"	1,278,939	80,585	6.3	23,547	48.5	25,037	51.5
Rest of State	2,175,059	87,769	4.0	9,556	48.7	10,073	51.3
Total State	3,453,998	168,354	4.9%	33,103	48.5%	35,110	51.5%

In table 3, 6% of the total school population in the "Big Five" is listed as gifted, in contrast to 4% of the school population for the rest of the State.

Table 3 contains the responses for questions 3 and 30. The author has divided the table in order to eliminate confusion with additional statistics which do not pertain to question 3.

QUESTION 5

SCHOOL BOARD POLICY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

5. Does your board of education have a policy statement that commits your school district to a course of action for identifying and educating the gifted? . . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT THE BOARD OF EDUCATION DOES HAVE OR DOES NOT HAVE A POLICY THAT COMMITS THE SCHOOL DISTRICT TO A COURSE OF ACTION FOR IDENTIFYING AND EDUCATING THE GIFTED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That The Board Of Education Does:			
	Have A Policy That Commits The School District To A Course Of Action For Identifying And Educating The Gifted		Not Have A Policy That Commits The School District To A Course Of Action For Identifying And Educating The Gifted	
	No.	%	No.	%
Total "Big Five"*	20	60.6	13	39.4
Rest of State	34	5.0	640	95.0
Total State	54	7.6%	653	92.4%

Table 4 connotes that throughout the "Big Five", 60% of the Boards of Education have a school district policy which deals with identifying and educating the gifted. The table further indicates that 95% of the Boards of Education within the remainder of the State do not have such a policy.

QUESTION 6

6. Does your school district have written administrative guidelines that spell out the action to be taken by the chief school officer, building principals, supervisors, classroom teachers, and specialists for the purpose of identifying the gifted and of developing appropriate programming for their needs? . . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT WRITTEN ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES ARE OR ARE NOT USED THAT SPELL OUT THE ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY THE CHIEF SCHOOL OFFICER, BUILDING PRINCIPALS, SUPERVISORS, CLASSROOM TEACHERS, AND SPECIALISTS FOR THE PURPOSE OF IDENTIFYING THE GIFTED AND OF DEVELOPING APPROPRIATE PROGRAMMING FOR THE NEEDS OF THE GIFTED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE - 1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That Written Administrative Guidelines: Are Used That Spell Out The Action To Be Taken By The Chief School Officer, Building Principals, Supervisors, Classroom Teachers, And Specialists For The Purpose Of Identifying The Gifted And Of Developing Appropriate Programming For The Needs Of The Gifted		Are Not Used That Spell Out The Action To Be Taken By The Chief School Officer, Building Principals, Supervisors, Classroom Teachers, And Specialists For The Purpose Of Identifying The Gifted And Of Developing Appropriate Programming For The Needs Of The Gifted	
	No.	%	No.	%
New York City				
High Schools	1			
Community Districts	19	67.9	9	32.1
Buffalo			1	
Rochester			1	
Syracuse			1	
Yonkers	1			
Total "Big Five"*	21	63.6	12	36.4
Rest of State	28	4.2	646	95.8
Total State	49	6.9%	658	93.1%

The responses to question 6 indicate that throughout the "Big Five," 64% of the school districts use written guidelines for the purpose of identifying and developing programs for the gifted. Within the rest of the State, 96% of the school districts do not use written guidelines.

QUESTION 8

8. Has a school district task force been established to provide continuing advisement and coordination in regard to gifted pupils on a K-12 basis?
. . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT A SCHOOL DISTRICT TASK FORCE HAS BEEN OR HAS NOT BEEN ESTABLISHED TO PROVIDE CONTINUING ADVISEMENT AND COORDINATION IN REGARD TO GIFTED PUPILS ON A K-12 BASIS

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE - 1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That A School District Task Force:			
	Has Been Established To Provide Continuing Advisement And Coordination In Regard To Gifted Pupils On A K-12 Basis		Has Not Been Established To Provide Continuing Advisement And Coordination In Regard To Gifted Pupils On A K-12 Basis	
	No.	%	No.	%
New York City				
High Schools	1			
Community Districts	8	28.6	20	71.4
Buffalo			1	
Rochester			1	
Syracuse			1	
Yonkers	1			
Total "Big Five"	10	30.3	23	69.7
Rest of State	54	8.0	620	92.0
Total State	64	9.1%	643	90.9%

Throughout the State's school districts, 91% have not established task forces for the purpose of continual advisement in regard to gifted pupils on a K-12 basis.

QUESTION 9

COMMUNITY AND STAFF SUPPORT

9. How do you assess your community's feelings about supporting your school district's efforts on behalf of the gifted? (Check one item only)

a. Strongly Supportive . . . [ ] (1)
b. Mildly Supportive . . . . [ ] (2)
c. Indifferent . . . . . [ ] (3)
d. Mildly Opposed. . . . . [ ] (4)
e. Strongly Opposed. . . . . [ ] (5)

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS ACCORDING TO THE ASSESSMENT OF COMMUNITY'S FEELINGS ABOUT SUPPORTING DISTRICTS EFFORTS ON BEHALF OF THE GIFTED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE - 1974-75

	School Districts Indicating That The Community's Feelings About Supporting Districts Efforts On Behalf Of The Gifted Are Assesed As:									
"Big Five" Summary	Strongly Supportive		Mildly Supportive		Indifferent		Mildly Opposed		Strongly Opposed	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
New York City										
High Schools	1									
Community Districts	12	42.9	16	57.1						
Buffalo	1									
Rochester					1					
Syracuse					1					
Yonkers	1									
Total "Big Five"*	15	45.5	16	48.5	2	6.1				
Rest of State	105	15.6	292	43.3	264	39.2	10	1.5	3	0.4
Total State	120	17.0%	308	43.6%	266	37.6%	10	1.4%	3	0.4%

In table 7, 94% of the school districts in the "Big Five" and 59% of the school districts in the remainder of the State indicated community feelings were generally supportive of districts efforts on behalf of the gifted. Across the total State, 38% of the school districts revealed that community feelings were generally indifferent to district's efforts on behalf of the gifted.

QUESTION 10

10. Are there any organized parent groups for the gifted in your community?
. . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT THERE ARE OR ARE NOT ANY ORGANIZED PARENT GROUPS FOR THE GIFTED IN THE COMMUNITY

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE - 1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That There:			
	Are Organized Parent Groups For The Gifted In The Community		Are Not Any Organized Parent Groups For The Gifted In The Community	
	No.	%	No.	%
New York City				
High Schools	1			
Community Districts	4	14.3	24	85.7
Buffalo			1	
Rochester			1	
Syracuse			1	
Yonkers			1	
Total "Big Five"*	5	15.2	28	84.8
Rest of State	21	3.1	653	96.9
Total State	26	3.7%	681	96.3%

Within the total State, 96% of the school districts do not have organized parent groups for the gifted in the community.

QUESTION 11

11. How do you assess the feelings of school district's professional staff about supporting the district's efforts on behalf of the gifted? (Check one item only)

a. Strongly Supportive . . . . . [ ] (1)
b. Mildly Supportive . . . . . [ ] (2)
c. Indifferent . . . . . [ ] (3)
d. Mildly Opposed. . . . . [ ] (4)
e. Strongly Opposed. . . . . [ ] (5)

TABLE 9

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS ACCORDING TO THE ASSESSMENT OF THE PROFESSIONAL STAFF'S SUPPORT OF DISTRICT'S EFFORTS ON BEHALF OF THE GIFTED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That The Feelings Of The Professional Staff About Supporting The District's Efforts On Behalf Of The Gifted Are Assessed As:									
	Strongly Supportive		Mildly Supportive		Indifferent		Mildly Opposed		Strongly Opposed	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
New York City										
High Schools	1									
Community Districts	16	57.1	12	42.9						
Buffalo			1							
Rochester			1							
Syracuse					1					
Yonkers					1					
Total "Big Five"*	17	51.5	14	42.4	2	6.1				
Rest of State	174	25.8	370	54.9	119	17.7	8	1.2	3	0.4
Total State	191	27.0%	384	54.3%	121	17.1%	8	1.1%	3	0.4%

The data in table 9 indicate that the professional staffs in 94% of the school districts in the "Big Five" were generally supportive of districts efforts on behalf of the gifted. Within the rest of the State, 81% of the school districts professional staffs were generally supportive. Throughout the total State, 17% were indifferent.

QUESTIONS 12 & 13

STATE SUPPORT OF EFFORTS FOR THE GIFTED

12. Should there be a special weighting formula to provide special financial State aid to assist local school districts in their efforts on behalf of the gifted? . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

13. Should there be some other way to provide State aid to school districts in support of their efforts on behalf of the gifted? . . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 10

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THEIR FEELINGS TOWARD STATE SUPPORT OF EFFORTS FOR THE GIFTED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE - 1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That:							
	A Special Weighting Formula Should Be Used		A Special Weighting Formula Should Not Be Used		Some Other Way Should Be Used		Some Other Way Should Not Be Used	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
New York City								
High Schools	1				1			
Community Districts	22	78.6	6	21.4	18	64.3	10	35.7
Buffalo	1				1			
Rochester	1						1	
Syracuse	1				1			
Yonkers	1						1	
Total "Big Five"*	27	81.8	6	18.2	21	63.6	12	36.4
Rest of State	471	69.9	203	30.1	298	44.2	376	55.8
Total State	498	70.4%	209	29.6%	319	45.1%	388	54.9%

For question 12, the data indicated that 70% of the total school districts throughout the state favored a special weighting formula to be used to provide special financial aid to school districts in their efforts on behalf of the gifted. Within the "Big Five," 64% of the districts favored some other way being established to provide financial aid to school districts on behalf of the gifted.

The author does not differentiate between questions 12 and 13. The narrative simply addresses itself to the main points of each question.

QUESTIONS 14 & 15

14. Please review the overall offerings for the gifted in your school district and characterize them primarily as the result of programming or provisions. (Check one item only)

a. Programming. . . . . [ ] (1)
b. Provisions . . . . . [ ] (2)
c. Neither programming nor provisions . . [ ] (3)

If your school does not have special programming for its gifted pupils, please answer question 15 below and return this form in the enclosed envelope.

15. Does your school district plan to initiate special programming for the gifted in the future?
. . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 11

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING WHETHER THEY HAVE PROGRAMS OR PROVISIONS FOR THE GIFTED AND IF THEY PLAN TO INITIATE SPECIAL PROGRAMMING IN THE FUTURE

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE - 1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	Number And Percent Of School Districts:									
	With Programming		With Provisions		With Neither		With Plans To Initiate Programming		With No Plans To Initiate Special Programming	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
New York City										
High Schools	1								1	
Community Districts	21	75.0	5	17.9	2	7.1	3	10.7	25	89.3
Buffalo	1								1	
Rochester	1								1	
Syracuse			1						1	
Yonkers			1						1	
Total "Big Five"*	24	72.7	7	21.2	2	6.1	3	9.1	30	90.9
Rest of State	101	15.0	326	48.4	247	36.6	148	22.0	526	78.0
Total State	125	17.7%	333	47.1%	249	35.2%	151	21.4%	556	78.6%

In table 11, 18% of the total school districts in the State designated a preference for programming; school districts that designated provisions totaled 48%. The school districts with neither programming nor provisions totaled 36%. Among the total school districts in the State, 79% had no plans to initiate special programming in the future for the gifted.

The author does not specify between questions 14 & 15. The narrative takes the main ideas of both questions into consideration.

QUESTION 16

IDENTIFYING THE GIFTED

16. In identifying gifted pupils, the school system uses the following criteria. (Check all that apply)

- a. Nomination by teachers . . . . . [ ]
- b. Nomination by parents. . . . . [ ]
- c. Nomination by peers. . . . . [ ]
- d. Creativity tests . . . . . [ ]
- e. Individual I.Q. tests . . . . . [ ]
- f. Group I.Q. tests. . . . . [ ]
- g. Case study. . . . . [ ]
- h. Autobiography . . . . . [ ]
- i. Student expression of value and ideals. . . [ ]
- j. Examination of unusual pupil products . . . [ ]
- k. Judgment of creativity by experts . . . . . [ ]
- l. Other (Specify)_____ [ ]

TABLE 12

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS
INDICATING TYPE OF CRITERIA USED IN IDENTIFYING GIFTED PUPILS

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	The School Districts, In Identifying Gifted Pupils, Use:											
	Teacher Nomination		Parental Nomination		Peer Nomination		Creativity Tests		Individual I.Q. Tests		Group I.Q. Tests	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total "Big Five"*	23	95.8	6	25.0	1	4.2	6	25.0	4	16.7	1	4.2
Rest of State	99	98.0	22	21.8	5	5.0	5	5.0	64	63.4	81	80.2
Total State	122	97.6	28	22.4	6	4.8	11	8.8	68	54.4	82	65.6

In identifying the gifted pupil, the following criteria were used most often by school districts throughout the State:

Teacher nomination 98%
Group I.Q. tests 66%
Individual I.Q. tests 54%
Examination of unusual pupil products 56%
Case study 32%
Other criteria 34%

The author included only those categories which had 30% of greater responses.

(Concluded)

TABLE 12

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS
INDICATING TYPE OF CRITERIA USED IN IDENTIFYING GIFTED PUPILS

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	The School Districts, In Identifying Gifted Pupils, Use:											
	Case Study		Auto-Biography		Student Expression Of Values		Examination Of Unusual Pupil Products		Experts' Judgment Of Creativity		Other Criteria	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
(24) Total "Big Five"*	5	20.8	2	8.3	4	16.7	14	58.3	8	33.3	17	70.8
(101) Rest of State	35	34.7	1	1.0	31	30.7	56	55.4	22	21.8	26	25.7
(125) Total State	40	32.0	3	2.4	35	28.0	70	56.0	30	24.0	43	34.4

* Data for "Big Five" in tables 12-28B are based on responses from 21 community districts in New York City and one response for New York City high schools, Buffalo and Rochester.

NOTE: Percents in tables 12-28B are based on number of returns indicated in parentheses at the left margin of table 12. Percents may not total 100 due to rounding.

QUESTION 18

18. At what grades does the identification process take place? (Check all that apply)

a. Pre-school - Kindergarten . . . . . [ ]
b. First Grade . . . . . [ ]
c. Second Grade. . . . . [ ]
d. Third Grade . . . . . [ ]
e. Fourth Grade. . . . . [ ]
f. Fifth Grade . . . . . [ ]
g. Sixth Grade . . . . . [ ]
h. Seventh Grade . . . . . [ ]
i. Eighth Grade. . . . . [ ]
j. Ninth Grade . . . . . [ ]
k. Tenth Grade . . . . . [ ]
l. Eleventh Grade. . . . . [ ]
m. Twelfth Grade . . . . . [ ]

TABLE 13

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING AT WHAT GRADES THE IDENTIFICATION OF GIFTED STUDENTS TAKES PLACE

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That The Identification Process Takes Place In The:											
	Pre-School - Kindergarten		First Grade		Second Grade		Third Grade		Fourth Grade		Fifth Grade	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total "Big Five"*	4	16.7	4	16.7	3	12.5	17	70.8	19	79.2	20	83.3
Rest of State	30	29.7	38	37.6	37	36.6	52	51.5	52	51.5	48	47.5
Total State	34	27.2	42	33.6	40	32.0	69	55.2	69	56.8	68	54.4

In the process of identifying the gifted pupil, 50% or greater of the selection by the total school districts in the State takes place between the 3rd and 9th grades.

(Concluded)

TABLE 13

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING
AT WHAT GRADES THE IDENTIFICATION OF GIFTED STUDENTS TAKES PLACE

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That The Identification Process Takes Place In The:													
	Sixth Grade		Seventh Grade		Eighth Grade		Ninth Grade		Tenth Grade		Eleventh Grade		Twelfth Grade	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total "Big Five"*	21	87.5	15	62.5	12	50.0	12	50.0	1	4.2	1	4.2	1	4.2
Rest of State	69	68.3	62	61.4	61	60.4	63	62.4	59	58.4	58	57.4	40	39.6
Total State	90	72.0	77	61.6	73	58.4	75	60.0	60	48.0	59	47.2	41	32.8

QUESTION 19

19. Are pupils systematically reevaluated as they progress from grade to grade as to the appropriateness of their placement in programs for the gifted? . . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 14

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT PUPILS ARE OR ARE NOT SYSTEMATICALLY REEVALUATED AS THEY PROGRESS FROM GRADE TO GRADE AS TO THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THEIR PLACEMENT IN PROGRAMS FOR THE GIFTED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Inidcating That Pupils:			
	Are Systematically Reevaluated As They Progress From Grade To Grade As To The Appropriateness Of Their Placement In Programs For The Gifted		Are Not Systematically Reevaluated As They Progress From Grade To Grade As To The Appropriateness Of Their Placement In Programs For The Gifted	
	No.	%	No.	%
New York City				
High Schools	1			
Community Districts	21	100.0		
Buffalo	1			
Rochester	1			
Syracuse				
Yonkers				
Total "Big Five"*	24	100.0		
Rest of State	83	82.2	18	17.8
Total State	107	85.6%	18	14.4%

Table 14 indicates that 86% of the school districts throughout the State reevaluate the gifted students as to the appropriateness of their placement in programs.

QUESTION 20

20. Are parents notified that their child has been identified as gifted? Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 15

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT PARENTS ARE OR ARE NOT NOTIFIED THAT THEIR CHILD HAS BEEN IDENTIFIED AS GIFTED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE - 1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School District Indicating That Parents:			
	Are Notified That Their Child Has Been Identified As Gifted		Are Not Notified That Their Child Has Been Identified As Gifted	
	No.	%	No.	%
New York City				
High Schools	1			
Community Districts	21	100.0		
Buffalo	1			
Rochester	1			
Syracuse				
Yonkers				
Total "Big Five"*	24	100.0		
Rest of State	68	67.3	33	32.7
Total State	92	73.6%	33	26.4%

Throughout the "Big Five," 100% of the school districts had notified parents that their child had been identified as gifted. In regards to the rest of the State, 33% of the school districts did not notify parents.

QUESTION 21

21. Is parental permission required before a child is placed in a gifted program? . . . . . .
. . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 16

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT PARENTAL PERMISSION IS OR IS NOT REQUIRED BEFORE A CHILD IS PLACED IN A GIFTED PROGRAM

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That Parental Permission:			
	Is Required Before A Child Is Placed In A Gifted Program		Is Not Required Before A Child Is Placed In a Gifted Program	
	No.	%	No.	%
New York City				
High Schools			1	
Community Districts	21	100.0		
Buffalo	1			
Rochester	1			
Syracuse				
Yonkers				
Total "Big Five"*	23	95.8	1	4.2
Rest of State	62	61.4	39	38.6
Total State	85	68.0%	40	32.0%

Table 16 connotes that throughout the State, 68% of the school districts required parental permission before placing a child in a gifted program. Within the "Big Five," 96% of the school districts required parental permission.

QUESTION 22

22. Does your school district exert special effort in locating and cultivating exceptionally high potential among socially disadvantaged children?
. . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 17

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT A SPECIAL EFFORT IS OR IS NOT EXERTED IN LOCATING AND CULTIVATING EXCEPTIONALLY HIGH POTENTIAL AMONG SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That A Special Effort:			
	Is Exerted In Locating And Cultivating Exceptionally High Potential Among Socially Disadvantaged Children		Is Not Exerted In Locating And Cultivating Exceptionally High Potential Among Socially Disadvantaged Children	
	No.	%	No.	%
New York City				
High School	1			
Community Districts	18	85.7	3	14.3
Buffalo			1	
Rochester	1			
Syracuse				
Yonkers				
Total "Big Five"*	20	83.3	4	16.7
Rest of State	40	39.6	61	60.4
Total State	60	48.0%	65	52.0%

Table 17 indicates that 83% of the school districts within the "Big Five" exerted special effort in locating and cultivating gifted pupils among socially disadvantaged children. Throughout the remainder of the State, 60% of the school districts did not.

QUESTION 23A

Check the appropriate box if your district provided the listed options for the gifted at the grade levels indicated. If not offered or available, check none (no).

Options	K-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	None
a. Compressed study[1/]					
b. Partial grouping[2/]					
c. Complete grouping[3/]					
d. Placed in honors sections					
e. Placed in ungraded classes					
f. College level study					
g. Class enrichment experiences					
h. After school enrichment experience					
i. Early admission to kindergarten or first grade					
j. Grade skipping					

[1/] Compressed study: Gifted pupils are allowed to complete two or more years in less time.

[2/] Partial grouping: Gifted pupils are placed in special groups for only part of the day or for only those academic subjects in which they are most able.

[3/] Complete grouping: Gifted pupils are grouped together for all academic subjects.

TABLE 18A

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT COMPRESSED STUDY IS PROVIDED FOR THE GIFTED AT GRADE LEVELS K-3, 4-6, 7-9, AND 10-12 OR IS NOT OFFERED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That Compressed Study Is Offered At Grade Levels:								School Districts Not Offering Compressed Study	
	K-3		4-6		7-9		10-12			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
New York City										
High Schools									1	
Community Districts	1	4.8	1	4.8	20	95.2			1	4.8
Buffalo									1	
Syracuse	1		1		1		1			
Yonkers										
Total "Big Five"*	2	8.3	2	8.3	21	87.5	1	4.2	3	12.5
Rest of State	6	5.9	6	5.9	23	22.8	50	49.5	45	44.6
Total State	8	6.4%	8	6.4%	44	35.2%	51	40.8%	48	38.4%

Table 18A indicates that 88% of the school districts in the "Big Five" offered a compressed study option at grade level 7-9. Throughout the remainder of the State school districts, 73% offered this option at grade levels 7-12.

TABLE 18B

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT PARTIAL GROUPING IS PROVIDED FOR THE GIFTED AT GRADE LEVELS K-3, 4-6, 7-9, AND 10-12 OR IS NOT OFFERED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That Partial Grouping Is Offered At Grade Levels:								School Districts Not Offering Partial Grouping	
	K-3		4-6		7-9		10-12			
	No.	%	No.	%	No	%	No.	%	No.	%
New York City										
High Schools							1			
Community Districts	3	14.3	2	9.5	6	28.6			14	66.7
Buffalo									1	
Rochester					1		1			
Syracuse										
Yonkers										
Total "Big Five"*	3	12.5	2	8.3	6	25.0	2	8.3	15	62.5
Rest of State	27	26.7	37	36.6	62	61.4	67	66.3	15	14.9
Total State	30	24.0%	39	31.2%	68	54.4%	69	55.2%	30	24.0%

Table 18B connotes that 63% of the school districts in the "Big Five" did not offer partial grouping options for the gifted. Throughout the remainder of the State, over 60% of the school districts offered partial grouping options at the grade levels 7-12.

TABLE 18C

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT COMPLETE GROUPING IS PROVIDED FOR THE GIFTED AT GRADE LEVELS K-3, 4-6, 7-9, AND 10-12 OR IS NOT OFFERED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That Complete Grouping Is Offered At Grade Levels:								School Districts Not Offering Complete Grouping	
	K-3		4-6		7-9		10-12			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
New York City										
High Schools							1			
Community Districts	3	14.3	19	90.5	14	66.7			1	4.8
Buffalo			1		1		1			
Rochester			1							
Syracuse										
Yonkers										
Total "Big Five"*	3	12.5	21	87.5	15	62.5	2	8.3	1	4.2
Rest of State	2	2.0	10	9.9	20	19.8	18	17.8	73	72.3
Total State	5	4.0%	31	24.8%	35	28.0%	20	16.0%	74	59.2%

Table 18C indicates that 88% of the school districts in the "Big Five" offered the complete grouping option at grade level 4-6; however, 72% of the districts throughout the remainder of the State did not offer the complete grouping option.

TABLE 18D

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT PLACING IN HONORS SECTIONS IS PROVIDED FOR THE GIFTED AT GRADE LEVELS K-3, 4-6, 7-9, AND 10-12 OR IS NOT OFFERED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That Placing In Honors Sections Is Offered At Grade Levels:								School Districts Not Offering Placing In Honors Sections	
	K-3		4-6		7-9		10-12			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
New York City										
High Schools							1			
Community Districts	1	4.8	2	9.5	11	52.4			10	47.6
Buffalo							1			
Rochester					1		1			
Syracuse										
Yonkers										
Total "Big Five"*	1	4.2	2	8.3	12	50.0	3	12.5	10	41.7
Rest of State					4	4.0	6	5.9	2	2.0
Total State	1	0.8%	2	1.6%	16	12.8%	9	7.2%	12	9.6%

As indicated in Table 18D, 50% of the school districts in the "Big Five" placed the gifted in honors sections at grade levels 7-9.

TABLE 18E

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT PLACING IN UNGRADED CLASSES IS PROVIDED FOR THE GIFTED AT GRADE LEVELS K-3, 4-6, 7-9, AND 10-12 OR IS NOT OFFERED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That Placing In Ungraded Classes Is Offered At Grade Levels:								School Districts Not Offering Placing In Ungraded Classes	
	K-3		4-6		7-9		10-12			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
New York City										
High Schools							1			
Community Districts	5	23.8	3	14.3					15	71.4
Buffalo									1	
Rochester	1									
Syracuse										
Yonkers										
Total "Big Five"*	6	25.0	3	12.5			1	4.2	16	66.7
Rest of State	13	12.9	13	12.9	7	6.9	12	11.9	77	76.2
Total State	19	15.2%	16	12.8%	7	5.6%	13	10.4%	93	74.4%

In table 18E, 74% of the school districts throughout the State did not offer ungraded classes for the gifted.

TABLE 18F

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT COLLEGE LEVEL STUDY IS PROVIDED FOR THE GIFTED AT GRADE LEVELS K-3, 4-6, 7-9, AND 10-12 OR IS NOT OFFERED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That College Level Study Is Offered At Grade Level:								School Districts Not Offering College Level Study	
	K-3		4-6		7-9		10-12			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
New York City										
High Schools							1			
Community Districts	1	4.8	1	4.8	1	4.8			20	95.2
Buffalo							1			
Rochester							1			
Syracuse										
Yonkers										
Total "Big Five"*	1	4.2	1	4.2	1	4.2	3	12.5	20	83.3
Rest of State			1	1.0	3	3.0	80	79.2	20	19.8
Total State	1	0.8%	2	1.6%	4	3.2%	83	66.4%	40	32.0%

Throughout the State, excluding the "Big Five," Table 18F indicates that 79% of the school districts offered college level study for the gifted at grade levels 10-12. Within the "Big Five," 83% of the school districts did not offer college level study for the gifted.

TABLE 18G

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT CLASS ENRICHMENT EXPERIENCES IS PROVIDED FOR THE GIFTED AT GRADE LEVELS K-3, 4-6, 7-9, AND 10-12 OR IS NOT OFFERED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That Class Enrichment Experiences Is Offered At Grade Levels:								School Districts Not Offering Class Enrichment Experiences	
	K-3		4-6		7-9		10-12			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
New York City										
High Schools							1			
Community Districts	9	42.9	15	71.4	17	81.0			3	14.3
Buffalo	1		1		1		1			
Rochester	1		1		1		1			
Syracuse										
Yonkers										
Total "Big Five"**	11	45.8	17	70.8	19	79.2	3	12.5	3	12.5
Rest of State	46	45.5	57	56.4	60	59.4	76	75.2	15	14.9
Total State	57	45.6%	74	59.2%	79	63.2%	79	63.2%	18	14.4%

Table 18G indicates that throughout the State over 57% of the school districts offered class enrichment experiences for the gifted at grade levels K-12.

Due to the multiple answers of many school districts, the author averaged out the Total State percents. (57%)

TABLE 18H

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT AFTER SCHOOL ENRICHMENT EXPERIENCE IS PROVIDED FOR THE GIFTED AT GRADE LEVELS K-3, 4-6, 7-9, AND 10-12 OR IS NOT OFFERED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE - 1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That After School Enrichment Experience Is Offered At Grade Levels:								School Districts Not Offering After School Enrichment Experiences	
	K-3		4-6		7-9		10-12			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
New York City										
High Schools							1			
Community Districts	1	4.8	2	9.5	4	19.0			17	81.0
Buffalo					1		1			
Rochester									1	
Syracuse										
Yonkers										
Total "Big Five"*	1	4.2	2	8.3	5	20.8	2	8.3	18	75.0
Rest of State	11	10.9	25	24.8	35	34.7	45	44.6	48	47.5
Total State	12	9.6%	27	21.6%	40	32.0%	47	37.6%	66	52.8%

Table 18H connotes that 70% of the Total State's school districts offered after school enrichment experiences at grade levels 7-12.

TABLE 181

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT EARLY ADMISSION TO KINDERGARTEN OR FIRST GRADE IS PROVIDED FOR THE GIFTED AT GRADE LEVELS K-3, 4-6, 7-9, AND 10-12 OR IS NOT OFFERED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE - 1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That Early Admission To Kindergarten Or First Grade Is Offered At Grade Levels:								School Districts Not Offering Early Admission To Kindergarten Or First Grade	
	K-3		4-6		7-9		10-12			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
New York City										
High Schools									1	
Community Districts	4	19.0							17	81.0
Buffalo									1	
Rochester	1									
Syracuse										
Yonkers										
Total "Big Five"*	5	20.8							19	79.2
Rest of State	8	7.9							93	92.1
Total State	13	10.4%							112	89.6%

In Table 181, 90% of the school districts throughout the State did not offer early admission to kindergarten or first grade for the gifted.

TABLE 18J

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT GRADE SKIPPING
IS PROVIDED FOR THE GIFTED AT GRADE LEVELS K-3, 4-6, 7-9, AND 10-12 OR IS NOT OFFERED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE - 1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That Grade Skipping Is Offered At Grade Levels:								School Districts Not Offering Grade Skipping	
	K-3		4-6		7-9		10-12			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
New York City										
High Schools									1	
Community Districts	3	14.3	1	4.8	2	9.5			16	76.2
Buffalo									1	
Rochester	1		1							
Syracuse										
Yonkers										
Total "Big Five"*	4	16.7	2	8.3	2	8.3			18	75.0
Rest of State	19	18.8	18	17.8	8	7.9	17	16.8	68	67.3
Total State	23	18.4%	20	16.0%	10	8.0%	17	13.6%	36	68.8%

Table 18J indicates that 69% of the school districts throughout the State did not offer grade skipping for the gifted.

QUESTION 24

24. Does the school district encourage the gifted high school students to take advantage of the Advanced Placement Courses of the College Entrance Examination Board?. . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 19

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT GIFTED HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS ARE OR ARE NOT ENCOURAGED TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE ADVANCED PLACEMENT COURSES OF THE COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE - 1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That Gifted High School Students:			
	Are Encouraged To Take Advantage Of The Advanced Placement Courses Of The College Entrance Examination Board		Are Not Encouraged To Take Advantage Of The Advanced Placement Courses Of The College Entrance Examination Board	
	No.	%	No.	%
New York City				
High Schools	1			
Community Districts	2	9.5	19	90.5
Buffalo	1			
Rochester			1	
Syracuse				
Yonkers				
Total "Big Five"*	4	16.7	20	83.3
Rest of State	82	81.2	19	18.8
Total State	86	68.8%	39	31.2%

Table 19 indicates that 69% of the school districts throughout the State encourage gifted high school students to take Advanced Placement Courses of the College Entrance Examination Board. Within the "Big Five," 83% of the school districts do not encourage Advanced Placement Courses for the gifted.

QUESTION 25

25. Does the school district encourage its gifted high school students to take advantage of the International Baccaulaureate (I.B.) Program (The I.B. Program is a program of study that prepares a student for a world-wide recognized university entrance examination. For most students, completion of the program is equivalent to the first two years of undergraduate work in American colleges and universities)?
. . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 20

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT GIFTED HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS ARE OR ARE NOT ENCOURAGED TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE INTERNATIONAL BACCAULAUREATE (I.B.) PROGRAM

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That Gifted High School Students:			
	Are Encouraged To Take Advantage Of The I.B. Program		Are Not Encouraged To Take Advantage Of The I.B. Program	
	No.	%	No.	%
New York City				
High Schools			1	
Community Districts			21	100.0
Buffalo			1	
Rochester			1	
Syracuse				
Yonkers				
Total "Big Five"*			24	100.0
Rest of State	1	1.0	100	99.0
Total State	1	0.8%	124	99.2%

In Table 20, 99% of the school districts in the State do not encourage gifted high school students to take advantage of the International Baccalaureate (I.B.) Program.

QUESTION 26

26. Does the school district publish special curriculum guides or other material to facilitate the education of the gifted? . . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 21

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT SPECIAL CURRICULUM GUIDES OR OTHER MATERIAL ARE OR ARE NOT PUBLISHED BY THE SCHOOL DISTRICT TO FACILITATE THE EDUCATION OF THE GIFTED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE - 1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That Special Curriculum Guides Or Other Materials:			
	Are Published By The School District		Are Not Published By The School District	
	No.	%	No.	%
New York City				
High Schools	1			
Community Districts	9	42.9	12	57.1
Buffalo			1	
Rochester			1	
Syracuse				
Yonkers				
Total "Big Five"*	10	41.7	14	58.3
Rest of State	38	37.6	63	62.4
Total State	48	38.4%	77	61.6%

In Table 21, special curriculum guides are not published by the school districts in 62% of the districts throughout the State. Curriculum guides are published, however, by 42% of the school districts in the "Big Five."

QUESTION 27

27. When the gifted are ready to enter the next higher school, does the sending school arrange to have them placed in an appropriate program? . . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 22

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT THE SENDING SCHOOL DOES OR DOES NOT ARRANGE TO HAVE THE GIFTED CHILD PLACED IN AN APPROPRIATE PROGRAM WHEN THE GIFTED CHILD IS READY TO ENTER THE NEXT HIGHER SCHOOL

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That The Sending School:			
	Does Arrange To Have The Gifted Child Placed In An Appropriate Program When The Gifted Child Is Ready To Enter The Next Higher School		Does Not Arrange To Have The Gifted Child Placed In An Appropriate Program When The Gifted Child Is Ready To Enter The Next Higher School	
	No.	%	No.	%
New York City				
High School	1			
Community	21	100.0		
Buffalo	1			
Rochester	1			
Syracuse				
Yonkers				
Total "Big Five"*	24	100.0		
Rest of State	82	81.2	19	18.8
Total State	106	84.8%	19	15.2%

Table 22 indicates that 85% of the school districts in the State arranged to have gifted students placed in an appropriate program upon entering the next higher school.

QUESTION 28

28. How long ago was the program for the gifted initiated? (Check one item only)

a. Within the last five years . . . . . [ ] (1)
b. Six or ten years ago . . . . . [ ] (2)
c. More then ten years ago. . . . . [ ] (3)

TABLE 23

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING WHEN THE GIFTED PROGRAM WAS INITIATED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That The Gifted Program Was Initiated:					
	Within Last Five Years		Six To 10 Years Ago		More Than 10 Years Ago	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
New York City						
High Schools					1	
Community Districts	1	4.8			20	95.2
Buffalo					1	
Rochester					1	
Syracuse						
Yonkers						
Total "Big Five"*	1	4.2			23	95.8
Rest of State	33	32.7	22	21.8	46	45.5
Total State	34	27.2%	22	17.6%	69	55.2%

In the "Big Five," 96% of the school districts indicated that programs for the gifted were initiated more than ten years ago. Within the last ten years, 54% of the school districts in the State initiated programs for the gifted.

QUESTION 29

29. At what grade level does the gifted program start? (Check one item only)

a. K-3 . . . . . [ ] (1)
b. 4-6 . . . . . [ ] (2)
c. 7-9 . . . . . [ ] (3)
d. 10-12 . . . . . [ ] (4)

TABLE 24

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING AT WHAT GRADE LEVEL THE GIFTED PROGRAM STARTS

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That The Gifted Program Starts At Grade Level:							
	K-3		4-6		7-9		10-12	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
New York City								
High Schools					1			
Community Districts	5	23.8	15	71.4	1	4.8		
Buffalo			1					
Rochester			1					
Syracuse								
Yonkers								
Total "Big Five"*	5	20.8	17	70.8	2	8.3		
Rest of State	30	29.7	25	24.8	39	38.6	7	6.9
Total State	35	28.0%	42	33.6%	41	32.8%	7	5.6%

Within the "Big Five," table 24 indicates that 71% of the school districts started their programs for the gifted at grade levels 4-6. Throughout the State, 66% of the school districts started their programs at grade levels 4-9.

QUESTION 30 A & B

30. a. What is the total enrollment of boys in gifted programs? . . . . . [ ]

b. What is the total enrollment of girls in gifted programs? . . . . . [ ]

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS
INDICATING STUDENTS LISTED AS GIFTED, ENROLLED IN GIFTED PROGRAMS AND
PROFESSIONAL STAFF ENGAGED IN COORDINATING GIFTED PROGRAMS ON DISTRICT LEVEL

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE - 1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	Students Listed As Gifted			Gifted Students In Programs			
	Students Enrolled	Number of Students Listed As Gifted	Percent of Gifted Students	Boys		Girls	
				No.	%	No.	%
New York City							
High Schools	342,940	30,000	8.7	15,000	50.0	15,000	50.0
Community Districts	781,044	45,805	5.9	8,547	46.0	10,037	54.0
Buffalo	58,113	2,800	4.8				
Rochester	42,367	1,400	3.3				
Syracuse	26,241						
Yonkers	28,234	580	2.1				
Total "Big Five"*	1,278,939	80,585	6.3	23,547	48.5	25,037	51.5
Rest of State	2,175,059	87,769	4.0	9,556	48.7	10,073	51.3
Total State	3,453,998	168,354	4.9%	33,103	48.5%	35,110	51.5%

The percentage of boys and the percentage of girls in gifted programs throughout the State in 1974-75 was about equal. In number, there were about 2,000 less boys than girls involved.

QUESTION 31

SELECTION AND PREPARATION OF STAFF

31. Is the professional staff of the school district made aware of and sensitive to the special educational needs of the gifted? . . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 25

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT THE PROFESSIONAL STAFF ARE OR ARE NOT MADE AWARE OF AND SENSITIVE TO THE SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF THE GIFTED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	The Professional Staff Of The School Districts Are:			
	Made Aware Of And Sensitive To The Special Educational Needs Of The Gifted		Not Made Aware Of And Are Not Sensitive To The Special Educational Needs Of The Gifted	
	No.	%	No.	%
New York City				
High Schools	1			
Community Districts	20	95.2	1	4.8
Buffalo			1	
Rochester			1	
Syracuse				
Yonkers				
Total "Big Five"*	21	87.5	3	12.5
Rest of State	86	85.1	15	14.9
Total State	107	85.6%	18	14.4%

In Table 25, 86% of the school districts throughout the State indicated that their professional staff are made aware of and sensitive to the special needs of the gifted.

QUESTION 32

32. Does the district engage outside resource people to help provide enrichment experiences for the gifted? . . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 26

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT OUTSIDE RESOURCE PEOPLE ARE OR ARE NOT ENGAGED BY THE DISTRICT TO PROVIDE ENRICHMENT EXPERIENCES FOR THE GIFTED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That Outside Resource People:			
	Are Engaged By The District To Provide Enrichment Experiences For The Gifted		Are Not Engaged By The District To Provide Enrichment Experiences For The Gifted	
	No.	%	No.	%
New York City				
High Schools	1			
Community Districts	9	42.9	12	57.1
Buffalo			1	
Rochester			1	
Syracuse				
Yonkers				
Total "Big Five"*	10	41.7	14	58.3
Rest of State	58	57.4	43	42.6
Total State	68	54.4%	57	45.6%

In the "Big Five," 58% of the school districts indicated that outside resource people are not engaged to provide enrichment experiences for the gifted.

Throughout the remainder of the State, 57% of the school districts did engage outside resource people.

QUESTION 33

33. Are teachers of the gifted required to:

a. Take special pre-service training . . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)
b. Take special in-service training. . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 27

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT TEACHERS OF THE GIFTED ARE OR ARE NOT REQUIRED TO TAKE SPECIAL PRE-SERVICE TRAINING AND/OR SPECIAL IN-SERVICE TRAINING

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That Teachers Of The Gifted:							
	Are Required To Take Special Pre-Service Training		Are Not Required To Take Special Pre-Service Training		Are Required To Take Special In-Service Training		Are Not Required To Take Special In-Service Training	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
New York City								
High Schools			1				1	
Community Districts	12	57.1	9	42.9	14	66.7	7	33.3
Buffalo			1				1	
Rochester			1		1			
Syracuse								
Yonkers								
Total "Big Five"*	12	50.0	12	50.0	15	62.5	9	37.5
Rest of State	11	10.9	90	89.1	14	13.9	87	86.1
Total State	23	18.4%	102	81.6%	29	23.2%	96	76.8%

Table 27 indicates that 82% of the school districts in the State did not require teachers of the gifted to take special pre-service training; also, 77% of the State did not require teachers of the gifted to take special in-service training.

QUESTION 35A

35. Is there an additional outlay earmarked and allocated in the school district budget for programs designed for the gifted? . . . . . .
. . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 28A

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATING THAT AN ADDITIONAL OUTLAY IS OR IS NOT EARMARKED AND ALLOCATED IN THE SCHOOL BUDGET FOR PROGRAMS DESIGNED FOR THE GIFTED

"BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	School Districts Indicating That An Additional Outlay:			
	Is Earmarked And Allocated In The School Budget For Programs Designed For The Gifted		Is Not Earmarked And Allocated In The School Budget For Programs Designed For The Gifted	
	No.	%	No.	%
New York City				
High Schools			1	
Community Districts	4	19.0	17	81.0
Buffalo			1	
Rochester			1	
Syracuse				
Yonkers				
Total "Big Five"*	4	16.7	20	83.3
Rest of State	25	24.8	76	75.2
Total State	29	23.2%	96	76.8%

Of the Total State's school districts, 77% did not have additional funds earmarked in the school's budget for programs for the gifted.

QUESTION 35B

TABLE 28B

DISTRIBUTION OF "BIG FIVE" CITIES AND TOTAL STATE
INDICATING AMOUNT OF TOTAL BUDGET EARMARKED FOR GIFTED PROGRAMS

1974-75

"Big Five" Summary	Total Budget And Percent Allocated For Gifted Programs		
	Total Budget	Dollar Amount Earmarked For Gifted Programs	Percent Of Total Budget Used For Gifted Programs
New York City			
High Schools			
Community Districts	$2,520,000,000.00[a/]	$539,716	.0214
Buffalo	119,793,602.54		
Rochester	93,391,435.54		
Syracuse	51,301,838.00		
Yonkers	63,654,072.74		
Total "Big Five"*	2,848,140,948.82	539,716	.0189
Rest of State	4,211,217,187.00	424,500	.0101
Total State	$7,059,358,135.82	$964,216	.0137%

[a/] Estimated total for New York City includes high schools

Table 28B indicates that less than one million dollars was earmarked for programs for the gifted during the 1974-75 fiscal year.

QUESTION 1

1. Does your BOCES board of education have a policy statement that commits your BOCES to a course of action for identifying and educating the gifted?
. . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

If yes, please enclose a copy of the policy statement.

TABLE 1

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BOCES INDICATING THAT THE BOCES BOARD OF EDUCATION DOES HAVE OR DOES NOT HAVE A POLICY STATEMENT THAT COMMITS THE BOCES TO A COURSE OF ACTION FOR IDENTIFYING AND EDUCATING THE GIFTED

BOCES REGIONS AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

BOCES Regions	BOCES Indicating That The BOCES Board of Education:			
	Does Have A Policy Statement		Does Not Have A Policy Statement	
	No.	%	No.	%
Capitol District Region	2	33.3	4	66.7
Central Region	1	20.0	4	80.0
Central Western Region	0	0.0	5	100.0
Lower Hudson Region	1	33.3	2	66.7
Mid-Hudson Region	0	0.0	4	100.0
Mohawk Region	0	0.0	4	100.0
Nassau Region	1	100.0	0	0.0
Ontario East Region	0	0.0	2	100.0
Northeast Region	0	0.0	2	100.0
Suffolk Region	1	33.3	2	66.7
Western Region	0	0.0	6	100.0
Southern Tier Region	0	0.0	5	100.0
Total State	6	13.0	40	87.0

In table 1, 87% of the BOCES Boards of Education throughout the State do not have a policy statement that commits BOCES to a course of action concerning the gifted.

QUESTION 2

2. Does your BOCES have written administrative guidelines that spell out the action to be taken by the District Superintendent and appropriate members of his staff for the purpose of identifying the gifted and developing appropriate programming for meeting their needs? . . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 2

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BOCES INDICATING THAT THE BOCES DO HAVE OR DO NOT HAVE WRITTEN ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES THAT SPELL OUT THE ACTION TO BE TAKEN BY THE DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT AND APPROPRIATE MEMBERS OF HIS STAFF FOR THE PURPOSE OF IDENTIFYING THE GIFTED AND DEVELOPING APPROPRIATE PROGRAMMING FOR MEETING THEIR NEEDS

BOCES REGIONS AND TOTAL STATE - 1974-75

BOCES Regions	BOCES That Do Have Written Administrative Guidelines		BOCES That Do Not Have Written Administrative Guidelines	
	No.	%	No.	%
Capitol District Region	1	16.7	5	83.3
Central Region	1	20.0	4	80.0
Central Western Region	0	0.0	5	100.0
Lower Hudson Region	1	33.3	2	66.7
Mid-Hudson Region	0	0.0	4	100.0
Mohawk Region	0	0.0	4	100.0
Nassau Region	1	100.0	0	0.0
Ontario East Region	0	0.0	2	100.0
Northeast Region	0	0.0	2	100.0
Suffolk Region	1	33.3	2	66.7
Western Region	3	50.0	3	50.0
Southern Tier Region	0	0.0	5	100.0
Total State	8	17.4	38	82.6

Throughout the State, 83% of BOCES do not have written administrative guidelines for the purpose of identifying and developing the gifted.

QUESTION 3

3. Do you offer one or more shared-service programs (as defined above) for the gifted? . . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 3

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BOCES THAT DO OFFER OF DO NOT OFFER ONE OR MORE SHARED-SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR THE GIFTED

BOCES REGIONS AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

BOCES Regions	BOCES Indicating That One Or More Shared-Service Programs:			
	Is Offered For The Gifted		Is Not Offered For The Gifted	
	No.	%	No.	%
Capitol District Region	1	16.7	5	83.3
Central Region	1	20.0	4	80.0
Central Western Region	2	40.0	3	60.0
Lower Hudson Region	2	66.7	1	33.3
Mid-Hudson Region	1	25.0	3	75.0
Mohawk Region	3	75.0	1	25.0
Nassau Region	1	100.0	0	0.0
Ontario East Region	1	50.0	1	50.0
Northeast Region	0	0.0	2	100.0
Suffolk Region	1	33.3	2	66.7
Western Region	1	16.7	5	83.3
Southern Tier Region	1	20.0	4	80.0
Total State	15	32.6	31	67.4

In table 3, 67% of BOCES did not offer shared-service programs for the gifted.

QUESTION 4

Is there a BOCES-wide Advisory Council on the gifted? . . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 4

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BOCES THAT DO HAVE OR DO NOT HAVE A BOCES-WIDE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE GIFTED

BOCES REGIONS AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

BOCES Regions	BOCES That Do Have A BOCES-Wide Advisory Council On The Gifted		BOCES That Do Not Have A BOCES-Wide Advisory Council On The Gifted	
	No.	%	No.	%
Capitol District Region	2	33.3	4	66.7
Central Region	3	60.0	2	40.0
Central Western Region	2	40.0	3	60.0
Lower Hudson Region	3	100.0	0	0.0
Mid-Hudson Region	1	25.0	3	75.0
Mohawk Region	2	50.0	2	50.0
Nassau Region	0	0.0	1	100.0
Ontario East Region	1	50.0	1	50.0
Northeast Region	0	0.0	2	100.0
Suffolk Region	1	33.3	2	66.7
Western Region	2	33.3	4	66.7
Southern Tier Region	1	20.0	4	80.0
Total State	18	39.1	28	60.9

able 4 indicates that 61% of BOCES throughout the tate do not have a BOCES-wide Advisory Council on the ifted.

QUESTION 5

5. Do you have a full-time coordinator of programs for the gifted? . . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 5

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BOCES THAT DO HAVE OR DO NOT HAVE A FULL-TIME COORDINATOR OF PROGRAMS FOR THE GIFTED

BOCES REGIONS AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

BOCES Regions	BOCES That Do Have A Full-Time Coordinator		BOCES That Do Not Have A Full-Time Coordinator	
	No.	%	No.	%
Capitol District Region	0	0.0	6	100.0
Central Region	0	0.0	5	100.0
Central Western Region	0	0.0	5	100.0
Lower Hudson Region	0	0.0	3	100.0
Mid-Hudson Region	0	0.0	4	100.0
Mohawk Region	0	0.0	4	100.0
Nassau Region	1	100.0	0	0.0
Ontario East Region	0	0.0	2	100.0
Northeast Region	0	0.0	2	100.0
Suffolk Region	0	0.0	3	100.0
Western Region	0	0.0	6	100.0
Southern Tier Region	0	0.0	5	100.0
Total State	1	2.2	45	97.8

Throughout the State, 98% of BOCES do not have a full-time coordinator of programs for the gifted.

QUESTION 6

6. Do you have a part-time coordinator of programs for the gifted? . . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 6

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BOCES THAT DO HAVE OR DO NOT HAVE A PART-TIME COORDINATOR OF PROGRAMS FOR THE GIFTED

BOCES REGIONS AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

BOCES Regions	BOCES That Do Have A Part-Time Coordinator		BOCES That Do Not Have A Part-Time Coordinator	
	No.	%	No.	%
Capitol District Region	2	33.3	4	66.7
Central Region	1	20.0	4	80.0
Central Western Region	1	20.0	4	80.0
Lower Hudson Region	2	66.7	1	33.3
Mid-Hudson Region	1	25.0	3	75.0
Mohawk Region	4	100.0	0	0.0
Nassau Region	0	0.0	1	100.0
Ontario East Region	0	0.0	2	100.0
Northeast Region	0	0.0	2	100.0
Suffolk Region	1	33.3	2	66.7
Western Region	1	16.7	5	83.3
Southern Tier Region	0	0.0	5	100.0
Total State	13	28.3	33	71.7

As indicated in table 6, 72% of BOCES in the State do not have a part-time coordinator of programs for the gifted.

QUESTION 7

7. Have you, in cooperation with local school districts, sponsored programs for the gifted (other than in #1 above)? . . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 7

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BOCES THAT HAVE OR HAVE NOT SPONSORED, IN COOPERATION WITH LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS, PROGRAMS FOR THE GIFTED

BOCES REGIONS AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

BOCES Regions	BOCES That Have Sponsored, In Cooperation With Local School Districts, Programs For The Gifted		BOCES That Have Not Sponsored, In Cooperation With Local School Districts, Programs For The Gifted	
	No.	%	No.	%
Capitol District Region	3	50.0	3	50.0
Central Region	3	60.0	2	40.0
Central Western Region	2	40.0	3	60.0
Lower Hudson Region	2	66.7	1	33.3
Mid-Hudson Region	3	75.0	1	25.0
Mohawk Region	4	100.0	0	0.0
Nassau Region	1	100.0	0	0.0
Ontario East Region	1	50.0	1	50.0
Northeast Region	1	50.0	1	50.0
Suffolk Region	1	33.3	2	66.7
Western Region	6	100.0	0	0.0
Southern Tier Region	0	0.0	5	100.0
Total State	27	58.7	19	41.3

In table 7, 59% of BOCES throughout the State have sponsored programs for the gifted in cooperation with local school districts.

QUESTION 8

8. Have you initiated one or more in-service activities (workshops, conferences, etc.) to better prepare teachers to deal more effectively with the problem of appropriate education for the gifted?
. . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 8

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BOCES THAT HAVE OR HAVE NOT INITIATED ONE OR MORE IN-SERVICE ACTIVITIES (WORKSHOPS, CONFERENCES, ETC.) TO BETTER PREPARE TEACHERS TO DEAL MORE EFFECTIVELY WITH THE PROBLEM OF APPROPRIATE EDUCATION FOR THE GIFTED

BOCES REGIONS AND TOTAL STATE - 1974-75

BOCES Regions	BOCES That Have Initiated One Or More In-Service Activities		BOCES That Have Not Initiated One Or More In-Service Activities	
	No.	%	No.	%
Capitol District Region	2	33.3	4	66.7
Central Region	3	60.0	2	40.0
Central Western Region	2	40.0	3	60.0
Lower Hudson Region	3	100.0	0	0.0
Mid-Hudson Region	1	25.0	3	75.0
Mohawk Region	4	100.0	0	0.0
Nassau Region	1	100.0	0	0.0
Ontario East Region	1	50.0	1	50.0
Northeast Region	0	0.0	2	100.0
Suffolk Region	1	33.3	2	66.7
Western Region	5	83.3	1	16.7
Southern Tier Region	2	40.0	3	60.0
Total State	25	54.3	21	45.7

Table 8 connotes that 54% of BOCES in the State have initiated one or more in-service activities to prepare teachers to deal with the gifted.

QUESTION 9

9. Do you plan to initiate any in-service activities within one year? . . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 9

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BOCES THAT
DO PLAN OR DO NOT PLAN TO
INITIATE IN-SERVICE ACTIVITIES WITHIN ONE YEAR

BOCES REGIONS AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

BOCES Regions	BOCES That Do Plan On Initiating In-Service Activities Within One Year		BOCES That Do Not Plan on Initiating In-Service Activities Within One Year	
	No.	%	No.	%
Capitol District Region	3	50.0	3	50.0
Central Region	4	80.0	1	20.0
Central Western Region	3	60.0	2	40.0
Lower Hudson Region	2	66.7	1	33.3
Mid-Hudson Region	1	25.0	3	75.0
Mohawk Region	4	100.0	0	0.0
Nassau Region	1	100.0	0	0.0
Ontario East Region	2	100.0	0	0.0
Northeast Region	0	0.0	2	100.0
Suffolk Region	2	66.7	1	33.3
Western Region	2	33.3	4	66.7
Southern Tier Region	3	60.0	2	40.0
Total State	27	58.7	19	41.3

Within the State, 59% of BOCES plan to initiate in-service activities for teachers within one year.

QUESTION 11

11. Do you sponsor instruction for the gifted at a BOCES facility? . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 10

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BOCES THAT DO SPONSOR OR DO NOT SPONSOR INSTRUCTION FOR THE GIFTED AT A BOCES FACILITY

BOCES REGIONS AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

BOCES Region	BOCES That Do Sponsor Instruction For The Gifted		BOCES That Do Not Sponsor Instruction For The Gifted	
	No.	%	No.	%
Capitol District Region	1	16.7	5	83.3
Central Region	1	20.0	4	80.0
Central Western Region	0	0.0	5	100.0
Lower Hudson Region	0	0.0	3	100.0
Mid-Hudson Region	0	0.0	4	100.0
Mohawk Region	1	25.0	3	75.0
Nassau Region	1	100.0	0	0.0
Ontario East Region	0	0.0	2	100.0
Northeast Region	0	0.0	2	100.0
Suffolk Region	0	0.0	3	100.0
Western Region	1	16.7	5	83.3
Southern Tier Region	0	0.0	5	100.0
Total State	5	10.9	41	89.1

Table 10 indicates that 89% of BOCES do not sponsor instruction for the gifted at a BOCES facility.

QUESTION 12

12. Do you plan to increase your efforts to encourage schools to provide appropriate programs for the gifted within the next year? . . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 11

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BOCES THAT DO PLAN OR DO NOT PLAN TO INCREASE THEIR EFFORTS TO ENCOURAGE SCHOOLS TO PROVIDE APPROPRIATE PROGRAMS FOR THE GIFTED WITHIN THE NEXT YEAR

BOCES REGIONS AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

BOCES Regions	BOCES That Do Plan To Increase Their Efforts		BOCES That Do Not Plan To Increase Their Efforts	
	No.	%	No.	%
Capitol District Region	4	66.7	2	33.3
Central Region	4	80.0	1	20.0
Central Western Region	4	80.0	1	20.0
Lower Hudson Region	3	100.0	0	0.0
Mid-Hudson Region	2	50.0	2	50.0
Mohawk Region	4	100.0	0	0.0
Nassau Region	1	100.0	0	0.0
Ontario East Region	2	100.0	0	0.0
Northeast Region	0	0.0	2	100.0
Suffolk Region	2	66.7	1	33.3
Western Region	6	100.0	0	0.0
Southern Tier Region	5	100.0	0	0.0
Total State	37	80.4	9	19.6

Throughout the State, 80% of BOCES plan to increase their efforts in order to encourage schools to provide programs for the gifted.

QUESTION 18

18. Are you willing to commit resources for the purpose of establishing in your BOCES Region a Regional Resource Research Development Demonstration and Dissemination Center for the gifted?
. . . . . Yes [ ] (1) No [ ] (2)

TABLE 13

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF BOCES THAT ARE WILLING OR ARE NOT WILLING TO COMMIT RESOURCES FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING A REGIONAL RESOURCE RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT DEMONSTRATION AND DISSEMINATION CENTER FOR THE GIFTED

BOCES REGIONS AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75

BOCES Regions	BOCES That Are Willing To Commit Resources		BOCES That Are Not Willing To Commit Resources	
	No.	%	No.	%
Capitol District Region	2	33.3	4	66.7
Central Region	3	60.0	2	40.0
Central Western Region	1	20.0	4	80.0
Lower Hudson Region	2	66.7	1	33.3
Mid-Hudson Region	3	75.0	1	25.0
Mohawk Region	4	100.0	0	0.0
Nassau Region	1	100.0	0	0.0
Ontario East Region	0	0.0	2	100.0
Northeast Region	0	0.0	2	100.0
Suffolk Region	2	66.7	1	33.3
Western Region	5	83.3	1	16.7
Southern Tier Region	2	40.0	3	60.0
Total State	25	54.3	21	45.7

Within the State, 54% of BOCES expressed willingness to commit resources for the purpose of establishing a regional demonstration and dissemination center for the gifted.

QUESTION 14 & 15

14. How much money was actually budgeted in 1974-75 for the education of gifted pupils? _____

15. How much money is being budgeted in 1975-76 for the education of gifted pupils? _____

TABLE 12

DISTRIBUTION OF BOCES INDICATING AMOUNT OF TOTAL BUDGET EARMARKED FOR THE EDUCATION OF GIFTED PUPILS

BOCES REGIONS AND TOTAL STATE

1974-75 and 1975-76

BOCES Regions	Amount Budgeted By The BOCES In:		Amount Budgeted For The Education Of Gifted Pupils In:		Percent of Total Budget Spent For The Education Of Gifted Pupils In:	
	1974-75	1975-76	1974-75	1975-76	1974-75	1975-76
Capitol District Region	$20,783,677	$22,046,610	$ 14,000	$ 29,280	.067	.133
Central Region	18,795,647	20,206,257	0	0	0	0
Central Western Region	25,950,582	29,922,202	11,942	12,570	.046	.042
Lower Hudson Region	30,817,088	29,977,085	19,800	19,800	.064	.066
Mid-Hudson Region	13,241,203	14,670,539	5,112	12,775	.039	.087
Mohawk Region	9,986,898	9,857,765	20,720	19,336	.208	.196
Nassau Region	39,510,558	40,136,000	158,000	185,000	.400	.461
Ontario East Region	6,854,918	8,068,763	0	19,000	0	.236
Northeast Region	4,324,510	5,042,268	0	0	0	0
Suffolk Region	36,902,355	43,285,933	26,000	25,000	.071	.058
Western Region	30,347,321	35,061,880	6,800	7,000	.022	.020
Southern Tier Region	19,438,015	17,508,306	0	0	0	0
Total State	$256,852,772	$275,783,608	$262,374	$329,761	.102	.120

Table 12 indicates that .10% and .12% of the total BOCES budget was spent on education for the gifted during 1974-75 and 1975-76 respectively.